DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 359 EA 016 790

AUTHOR Feir, Robert E.
TITLE Curriculum Politics: Approaching 1984.
PUB DATE 23 Apr 84
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum; *Educational Change; *Educational Environment; Educational History; Educational Research; Literature Reviews; National Surveys; Policy Formation; *Political Influences; Political Issues; Political Power; *Politics of Education; Program Implementation; Socioeconomic Influences; *State Action; State Curriculum Guides; Systems Analysis; Systems Approach; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

Beginning with a capsule history of United States education reform efforts and an examination of the American "myth" of the apolitical nature of education, this paper explores the political bases of education policy. Reviewing the literature on educational politics with a particular concern for recent curriculum reform efforts at the state level, the author follows Campbell and Mazzoni in using a general political systems theory to focus on policy decisions, system actors, and functional relations. The following political systems measures were used to examine state curriculum policy activity: (1) political culture, (2) education centralization, (3) the scope of governemnt, (4) the welfare-education dimension, (5) interparty competition, (6) interest group strength, (7) legislative professionalism, and (8) the power of governors. After brief discussions of each of these eight measures, the author provides a survey synopsis of state curriculum policy activities and key actors and concludes by calling for additional research into the relationship of state curriculum policy development and public education finance; and (2) state curriculum policy and its implementation on the local level. Also included are three pages of references and five appendixes with data on the extent of involvement of the individual states in various curriculum policy activities. (JBM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED244359

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert E. Feir

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CURRICULUM POLITICS: APPROACHING 1984

Robert E. Feir
Pennsylvania Department of Education

April 1984

This paper was prepared for presentation to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans, April 23, 1984.

EA 016 790

CURRICULUM POLITICS: APPROACHING 1984*

Robert E. Feir**

1984. A year pregnant with meaning--different meanings in different contexts. For our purposes, however, 1984 is an election year, the first in some time in which education is a real and significant issue. Across the country, candidates for state and national office are focusing on and debating various proposals to reform the schools. Regardless of whether educators approve or disapprove of the "politicization" of their field, the fact is that educational reform will grow largely out out of economic and socio-political considerations external to the schools themselves.

The purpose of this paper is to review some of those external considerations--the context of education reform, with particular attention to the establishment and reform of curriculum policy at the state level.

So that we are looking at the same phenomena, this paper takes curriculum to be that set of goal-directed strategies, activities, and materials which schools employ to instruct students; it takes policy to be communicated decisions about institutional directions; and it takes politics to be the authoritative allocation of resources among competing interests.

Education in the United States was not designed to be an institution apart from the larger community, but was established rather to serve economic and social functions perceived as important by the leaders of the colonial society (Cremin, 1970). Whether one views the schools benignly as mirroring and preparing young people to enter society, as do most mainstream educational historians, or as limiting and stunting the growth of students in an effort to reconstruct social inequality (e.g., Apple, 1982), the schools nonetheless do serve the larger society in which they are embedded.

The roots of much of our discussion in the 1980s can be traced to the early twentieth century curriculum reforms, and a brief review is in order.

Curriculum designers after the turn of the century believed that curriculum could more efficiently achieve the school's goal, which was seen as preparing young people for citizenship. Their job was to develop a rational curriculum based empirically on what adults needed to know to succeed in society (Reid, 1975). This approach to curriculum reform mirrored efforts to reform the structure and management of the schools and of state and local government in general. Among the major goals of education reformers in the early years of the century--aside from curriculum reform itself--were the elimination of decentralized school boards (particularly in large cities) and local ward boss control of the schools, development of nonpartisan at-large elections (for school boards and local governments, albeit separate elections

---

*This paper was prepared for presentation to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1984.

**Robert E. Feir is special assistant for legislative services in the Pennsylvania Department of Education and has served as a curriculum development coordinator for a school district in Rhode Island. This paper is in no way intended to represent the Pennsylvania Department of Education or the Secretary of Education and is the author's work solely.

for the two), smaller school boards, and increased professionalization of school district management (Scribner and Englert, 1977). Who were these early reformers? They were educators, business people, and professionals, and their stress on expertise, professionalization, efficiency, and nonpolitical control of the schools resulted in increased power for themselves (Wirt and Kirst, 1972) and a marked shift in power away from the working classes (Scribner and Englert, 1977). This tradition of reform is, perhaps, even older. Katz (1968, p. 218) argues that "the extension and reform of education in the mid-nineteenth century were not a potpourri of democracy, rationalism, and humanitarianism. They were the attempt of a coalition of the social leaders, status-anxious parents, and status-hungry educators to impose educational innovation, each for their own reasons, upon a reluctant community."

In any event, it is at least to the early twentieth century reforms that the roots of the myth that education--or at least curriculum--is apolitical, can be traced (Scribner and Englert, 1977). "On one subject, the myth of an apolitical education has gone long unchallenged. Both those who practice and those who study it have endorsed the separation of curriculum issues from ordinary political processes" (Wirt and Kirst, 1972, p. 202).

As American society grew rapidly more complex in the 1930s, the rational curriculum model of the preceding years gave way in part to progressivism, with educators trying to prepare young people not for a stable future, but rather to deal with a society in flux (Reid, 1975). To some degree, this shift, based largely on changing perceptions of social need, grew also out of a shift among curriculum developers from emphasizing subject matter as the main source of curriculum objectives to emphasizing the learner as the primary source (Tanner and Tanner, 1975).

Through the first half of the century, schools in the United States undertook a variety of tasks required by the economy or changing political factors. During the great waves of immigration, particularly among non-English-speaking people, the schools introduced Americanization programs; during the 1930s, the schools countered the threat of totalitarianism with programs stressing the values of democratic life; during the Second World War, the schools introduced manpower training programs to ease the war-induced manpower shortage (Wirt and Kirst, 1972).

The post-Sputnik era of the late 1950s and early 1960s saw a partial return to the rationalism of the pre-progressive years, along with an emphasis on higher standards for students through a more demanding curriculum (Reid, 1975). Ravitch (1983) has pointed out that much of the curriculum reform in the post-Sptutnik years grew from the federal government's concern about the need for improved technical skills in society. Unlike curriculum change that occurs slowly, incrementally, every day in schools, universities, and research institutes across the country, the response to Sputnik was public, rapid, and consistent. "The critical factor in the climate of opinion which led to the resurgence of the rational model was that the demand for curriculum renewal arose from general public concern, and not merely from trends in the private world of the educator. . .." (Reid, 1975, p. 242). While the reform effort began as a shift from the learner as source of curriculum goals to the larger society as the primary source (Tanner and Tanner, 1975), the end result of the new curricula in mathematics, the physical, natural, and social sciences was a reemphasis of subject matter as the primary source (Eisner, 1971).

The larger society as a principal source of curriculum objectives was to reemerge in the late 1960s and 1970s, as schools and colleges responded to the seemingly cataclysmic changes arising from movements with their roots in the civil rights struggles of blacks and from reactions to the Vietnam War (Ravitch, 1983). These movements were too disparate, and ultimately too weak politically to result in overall long-term curricular changes. In time, society's dominant elements would redefine curriculum reform in more traditional ways, as we are seeing today.

Much of the curriculum reform of the past three-quarters of a century has been shown, hopefully, to have grown directly or indirectly out of various economic and political concerns. This has not always resulted in the kind of curriculum that education professionals would prefer or support, nor has it always been good for students or schools (Ravitch, 1983). Tanner and Tanner (1975) summarize this position:

> Efforts to induce change in educational practice tend to be undertaken as expedient and opportunistic responses to the dominant sociopolitical forces rather than stemming from a rationale based upon sound theory and conceptual research. In the absence of a guiding theoretical base buttressed by conceptual research, curriculum reforms often are promoted as consensual reactions to emerging crises. The consequence of this is that the gap between theory and practice grows even wider as innovations and reform measures are adopted, modified, discarded, and rediscovered. . .. (p. 53).

This view that curriculum reform should, or can, grow out of "sound theory and conceptual research" rather than "dominant sociopolitical forces," is a modern day reflection of the myth of education as apolitical, referred to above.

But this myth has another side. According to Iannaccone (1967) the myth has

> . . . two potential dangers: (1) an implicit rejection of the mainstream of the American political system itself, and (2) a loss of touch with reality--a self-seduction which is the most dangerous form of fascination. The prevailing pattern of educational politics, at state and local levels, pays tribute . . . to this enticement of educationists by the echoes of their own voices . . .. (p. 8).

If this disagreement were merely one of values, it would be serious enough. But the belief that education generally and curriculum specifically are or can be apolitical is particularly troubling in light of the historical evidence to the contrary. It is also of concern because education professionals who wish to influence the development of curriculum policy (as opposed to those who are satisfied with the development of curriculum approaches, materials, etc.) would be more effective by disavowing the myth. As Reid and Walker (1975) see it:

> . . . the more we insist that curriculum planning is rational and not political, . . . the more certain we make it that the end of our endeavors will bear little resemblance to the high

> hopes with which we began. . . . Part of the answer is to make sure that curriculum planning is itself to a degree political, thereby preventing it from being subject to an entirely different set of considerations from those that govern implementation. (p. 255).

One result of educators clinging to the myth of education as apolitical has been an emphasis on conflict avoidance and consensus building as a way to solve problems. This can be seen in most of the curriculum texts which most professional educators read in graduate school (Kirst and Walker, 1971). However, if curriculum policy emerges from political processes, which are based ultimately upon resolution of conflict, rather than avoidance of it, the approach educators make to politics, when they approach that system at all, is often less than effective (Scribner and Englert, 1977).

The next section of this paper is designed to examine the education policy system and its political bases, with a particular concern for recent efforts at curriculum reform. As a field of study and research, educational politics is not very deep, in large part because of the pervasiveness until recently of the myth of education as an apolitical realm (Scribner and Englert, 1977).

Much of the work that has been done in educational politics has been an effort to develop or adapt models to aid in our understanding of the field. Scribner and Englert (1977) have developed a conceptual framework based upon systems theory and allocative theory. Systems theory envisions the political process as allocating resources (values) by transforming inputs, consisting of demands on and supports of the system, from the larger social setting (the environment) into policies (outputs), which engender new supports and elicit new demands (feedback). Allocative theory is based largely on the distribution of influence within the system, with influence being dependent upon the possession of resources, the willingness to use them, and their actual application (more on this later). Lutz (1977) has elaborated six models for conceptualizing political power in education: general systems theory, class structure, ideal typical, participation, comparative-descriptive, and political-psychological. Wirt (1977) has made a significant contribution to understanding interstate variations in education political systems through construction of an index of centralization of power. He has developed a seven-point continuum of centralization, ranging from absence of state authority to permissive local autonomy to required local autonomy to extensive local option under state mandated requirements to limited local option under state mandated requirements to no local option under state mandated requirements to total state assumption. In a more limited framework, Iannaccone (1967) has studied education politics in eleven state legislatures and developed four models of relationships between interest groups (including education professionals) and legislatures: locally based disparate lobbies, statewide monolithic lobbies, statewide fragmented lobbies, and statewide syndical lobbies.

Two efforts have been particularly helpful in trying to place in perspective and understand the current wave of curriculum reform activity in the nation. Campbell and Mazzoni (1976), in their study of twelve states, focus on state policy making for public schools, using general political systems theory and concentrating on policy decisions, system actors, and functional relations.

As does this paper, their study views policy decisions as system outputs. The system actors they studied include governors, legislatures, state school boards, chief state school officers, state education agencies, and interest groups. They see differences in levels of influence among the system actors depending upon the nature of the functional relationships, which they identify in terms of issue definition, proposal formulation, support mobilization, and decision enactment.

While the earliest state efforts to control education can be traced to the Massachusetts school laws of 1642 and 1647, centralized authority in American education has taken a back seat to local administration through much of our history (Butts and Cremin, 1953). Mitchell and Encarnation (1983) see the recent growth in power of state level policy systems resulting from pressure by disadvantaged and minority groups, economic changes requiring a more technically trained student body, increased fiscal inequity at the local level, and increased judicial intervention, all of which burden local policy systems. It is in their study of the growth of the state policy system that Mitchell and Encarnation develop the second model that is particularly helpful in the current context--a theoretical taxonomy of state policy strategies, which they claim includes seven inclusive and mutually exclusive strategies. These are structural organizational, revenue generation, resource allocation, program definition, curriculum materials development, personnel training and certification, and student achievement testing.

In looking at current efforts to reform curriculum, it is appropriate to examine the roles played by the various system actors as they attempt to define issues, formulate proposals, mobilize support, and enact policy decisions (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976). These types of activity can be studied by examining the strategies identified by Mitchell and Encarnation (1983), especially program definition, student achievement testing, personnel training and certification, and resource allocation. (While curriculum materials development logically should be included, this does not seem to be a major emphasis of state policy development at the moment.)

Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) found that state school boards were not very significant system actors unless they had access to the political power of either the governor or the legislature. Those boards which appointed the chief state school officer had some additional influence through him. They also found that the chief state school officers were not very influential, although influence increased with the size and professionalism of the state education agency. Governors were seen as increasingly involved and influential in education policy making. This was particularly true in states with high levels of state support for education. The increased involvement of governors in such states can be seen as reflecting their insistence on accountability or their awareness of the importance of education's role in the state's political life. Governors were found to be most influential in defining issues and formulating proposals, and their influence seemed to increase in those states with the most technically competent legislatures, suggesting a commonality of interest and sharing of power. Legislatures "play the most vital role in the determination of educational policy" (p. 202), the authors found. This was particularly true in formulating proposals and enacting decisions. Lobbyists, including education professionals, are more influential in legislatures with less technical expertise and which are, therefore, more dependent upon lobbyists for informa-

tion. When policy issues are considered in an educational context, such information is particularly influential, but when issues are considered in a more partisan political context, influence is more easily exercised by groups with access to campaign contributions and votes.

Where can education professionals be most influential in the development of state policy? Iannaccone (1977) identifies three orientations to change in educational governance: change in the service function of education, change in the political function of government in managing conflict, and controversy over ideological assumptions and organizational structures. He sees education professionals as most influential in the first area, which would include issues such as curriculum reform. In his earlier work, Iannaccone (1967) found that educators in locally based disparate lobbying structures were more effective at stopping than at passing legislation; those in statewide monolithic lobbying structures were effective at both stopping and passing legislation and exercised leadership in obtaining additional resources for education; some of those in statewide fragmented lobbying structures were successful and others unsuccessful on any given issue; and those in statewide syndical lobbying structures were effective at stopping legislation and passing bills upon which they agreed, but did not exercise all the power they might have, in an effort to avoid internal conflicts.

Rosenthal and Fuhrman (1982) contend that education professionals have lost much of their influence during the past decade as legislatures have increased their own professionalism and access to information and as the once united education lobby began to split apart, largely over issues related to collective bargaining by teachers. The power recently exercised by formal governmental structures such as legislatures had been latent for years (Unruh, 1983), but needed the right set of circumstances to be unleashed. While Rosenthal and Fuhrman attribute the growth in legislative influence largely to the professionalization of the institution, there is at least one other factor that should be considered.

Power can be derived in the political system from legal authority, information and expertise, social status, wealth, group cohesion, and electoral potency (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976). In order to have real power, however, system actors must be willing to mobilize their resources (latent power). Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) found that this willingness to mobilize resources depends on a variety of situational factors, including differential saliency for the actors. What makes an issue salient? In some cases personal or political commitment will suffice, in others accountability for major programs (such as the greater involvement of governors in states with high levels of support for education) is required. Often, for system actors who attain and retain their positions through elections, perceptions of public sentiment serve to increase the saliency of an issue (Barth and Johnson, 1959) (such as the mass support for curriculum reform in the post-Sputnik era). It would seem that those of us concerned about curriculum reform are at such a moment of heightened saliency again, which helps explain the historically unusual amount of curriculum policy activity in state capitals across the country (Walton, 1983).

While there is much activity in many state policy making systems which will lead to curriculum policy changes, a good deal of that activity is still far from fruition. And while some policy changes have been enacted, few have been implemented as yet. The result is that it is difficult to analyze the

changes themselves with any great degree of sophistication. Nonetheless, it should be possible to see what relationships, if any, exist between state curriculum policy activity on the one hand and a variety of political system measures on the other. There is a temptation to try to quantify these relationships, to view the curriculum policy activity as the dependent variable and the political system measures as independent variables. The diffuse nature of the curriculum policy activity at this early stage in its development mitigates against the use of statistical techniques, however, because it is not yet possible to define in a consistent manner the nature of those activities in various states. Nonetheless, it is possible to attempt a comparative descriptive analysis that looks at all states, in lieu of specious statistical analysis and prior to detailed single state case study analysis. The remainder of this paper is an attempt at such a descriptive analysis, based largely upon a fifty-state survey of current curriculum policy activity (Walton, 1983) and a variety of political system measures which are reviewed in Katz's (1981) study for the NIE School Finance Project.

Some of the education policy activity in the states which Walton (1983) identifies in her survey is not related to curriculum policy development. Only the activity clearly related to curriculum policy was included in this review, and that activity was then assigned to one of four state education policy strategies identified by Mitchell and Encarnation (1983): program definition, student achievement testing, personnel training and certification, and resource allocation. Within those strategies, the state curriculum policy activity was examined in terms of the following political system measures (Katz, 1981):

1. Political Culture: The states are ranked along a continuum from the most "traditionalist" to the most "moralistic," with greater gubernatorial and legislative power and higher voter turnout associated with the latter and greater state control of education associated with the former. (The data are from Ira Sharkansky's "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture: A Research Note," Polity 2 (Fall 1969).)

2. Education Centralization: The states are ranked along a seven point continuum of centralization of state educational systems, as described above (Wirt, 1977).

3. Scope of Government: The states are ranked on their penetration into social life, on the basis of tax level per capita and per income unit, per capita expenditures, and state employment. (The data are from John Crittenden's "Dimensions of Modernization in the American States," American Political Science Review 61 (December 1967).)

4. Welfare-Education Dimension: The states are ranked on 26 variables intended to measure welfare and education policy outputs, and can be used in conjunction with the scope of government measure to assess the importance of education and welfare issues in the scope of government in a given state. (The data are from Ira Sharkansky's and Richard Hofferbert's "Dimensions of State Politics, Economics, and Public Policy," American Political Science Review 68 (September 1969).)

5. Interparty Competition: The states are grouped as one-party Democratic, modified one-party Democratic, two-party, and modified one-party Republican. For our purposes, modified one-party Democratic and modified

one-party Republican were combined. It is presumed that political activity increases as the degree of interparty competition increases. (The data are from Austin Ranney's "Parties in State Politics" in Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth Vines (eds.), Politics in the American States: A Comparative Analysis (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976).)

6. Interest Group Strength: The states are grouped as having strong, moderate, or weak interest group influence. It is presumed that states in which there is strong interest group influence will be more politically active, and that educators potentially will be more influential in curriculum policy decisions in such states. (The data are from Lewis A. Froman, Jr.'s "Some Effects of Interest Group Strength on State Politics," American Political Science Review 60 (December 1966).)

7. Legislative Professionalism: The states are ranked on degree of legislative professionalism, based on legislative compensation, expenditures for staff and services, number of bills introduced, length of sessions, and a legislative services score by the Citizens Committee on State Legislatures. It is presumed that states that rank high in legislative professionalism will have more political activity, with more of it concentrated in the legislature, particularly in the areas of proposal formulation and decision enactment (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976). (The data are from John G. Grumm's "The Effects of Legislative Structure on Legislative Performance," in Richard Hofferbert and Ira Sharkansky (eds.), State and Urban Politics: Readings in Comparative Public Policy (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1971).)

8. Power of Governors: This is the composite ranking of states on the powers of governors in terms of tenure potential, appointments, budget, and vetoes. It is presumed that states with powerful governors will experience increased political activity, with the governor assuming a predominant role, particularly in terms of issue definition and proposal formulation (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976). It should be remembered that strong governors and professional legislatures often work in tandem, rather than in conflict (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976). (The data are from Joseph A. Schlesinger's "The Politics of the Executive," in Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines (eds.), Politics in the American States: A Comparative Analysis (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971).)

Only twelve state are not involved in some curriculum policy activity which Mitchell and Encarnation (1983) would call program definition. Of these, six rank in the bottom quartile on the traditionalist to moralistic political culture continuum, implying low levels of state control. Eight rank in the bottom two quartiles. Of the other four states, three rank in the bottom two quartiles on education centralization, and the other ranks low on scope of government and exceptionally low (45th) on the welfare-education dimension. (See Appendix A)

Student achievement testing is not quite so popular a curriculum policy area, with nineteen states uninvolved. Of these, seven rank in the bottom quartile on the traditionalist to moralistic political culture continuum, and eleven rank in the bottom two quartiles (no data are available on two others).

Of the remaining six states, two are in the bottom two quartiles on the education centralization score. Two others might be described by low scores on scope of government and/or the welfare-education dimension. (See Appendix B)

All but eight states are involved in personnel training and certification activities connected with curriculum policy development. Of these eight, six are in the bottom quartile on the traditionalist to moralistic political culture continuum, and seven are in the bottom two quartiles. The other is in the bottom two quartiles on the education centralization score. (See Appendix C)

While 29 states are involved in resource allocation activities clearly related to curriculum policy development, all but two are also involved in activity in at least one of the other areas. Both of those which are active only in resource allocation are in the bottom quartile on the traditionalist to moralistic political culture continuum.

Fifteen states are involved in activities in all four areas of curriculum policy development--program definition, student achievement testing, personnel training and certification, and resource allocation. Of these, seven are in the top quartile on the traditionalist to moralistic political culture continuum, implying high levels of state control, and twelve are in the top two quartiles. Of the other three states, one is in the top two quartiles on education centralization, and another ranks tenth on the welfare-education dimension. (See Appendix D)

Who are the key actors? Governors clearly are key actors in eight states. Of the eight, three are in the top quartile on the measure of the governor's strength, and five are in the top two quartiles. Of the other three, one is the chief executive of a state in the top quartile on education centralization. Of the eight governors playing leading roles in curriculum policy development, four share that responsibility with their state legislatures. In all four of those states, the legislature's professionalism ranks higher than the governor's power, supporting the findings by Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) that strong governors and professional legislatures often work together on education issues. (See Appendix E)

Legislatures are key actors in 21 states. Of these, six rank in the top quartile in legislative professionalism, and twelve rank in the top two quartiles. Of the other nine states, five rank in the top quartile on education centralization. (See Appendix F)

There is nothing conclusive claimed about any of these findings, given the softness of the data and the "in flux" nature of the situations being reviewed. Nonetheless, most of the curriculum policy development activities and political system relationships presumed from earlier studies are generally upheld.

There is still a considerable research agenda ahead. As the current wave of curriculum reform becomes history, close attention should be paid to the types of strategies (Mitchell and Encarnation, 1983) and to the system actors and functional relationships (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976) which result in actual changes in curriculum policy in individual states. This type of comparative research can be buttressed by well conceived single state case studies.

Two other related areas of research should also be undertaken in conjunction with the curriculum policy development research. First, efforts should be made to determine what relationships exist between state curriculum policy development in the mid-1980s and state prospects for public education finance during the remainder of the century (Sherman, 1982). Mitchell and Encarnation (1983) indicate that education policy generally has been directed at one or more of the following goals: efficiency, equity, and quality. While they believe policy can be directed at more than one at any given time, they indicate that policy rarely is directed at two or more. As the focus of education policy shifts from equity concerns to quality concerns, it is important to keep differential fiscal resources in mind, for quality ultimately cannot be improved without adequate fiscal support.

Second, researchers concentrating on state curriculum policy making must remember that the only meaningful test of such policy is its implementation in individual school buildings and classrooms, often far removed physically, culturally, and politically from state capitals. While this point has been made with some frequency (e.g., Eisner, 1971; Iannaccone, 1972; Popkewitz, Tabachnick, and Wehlage, 1982; Ravitch, 1983; Reid and Walker, 1975), it is easy to forget, given the limited scope of any research effort.

Curriculum as it is implemented is the work of teachers and administrators. As it is implemented, it is influenced by university professionals, curriculum scholars, textbook publishers, and a host of locally perceived sociopolitical variables. But there are limits on local implementation of curricula--limits imposed primarily by state government. Explaining that state curriculum policy development system has been the purpose of this paper. Reid and Walker (1975) provide a fitting conclusion:

> The problem is not how authority, whether in the shape of government, administrators or subject disciplines, can be thwarted, but how it can be used as a resource to help schools develop courses appropriate to them and their students. (p. 251).

References

Apple, M. W. Education and power. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Barth, E. A. T. and Johson, S. D. Community power and a typology of social issues. Social forces 38 (October 1959).

Butts, R. F. and Cremin, L. A. A history of education in American culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Campbell, R. F. and Mazzoni, T. L., Jr. State policy making for the public schools. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1976.

Coombs, F.S. Opportunities in the comparison of state education policy systems. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

Cremin, L. A. American education: the colonial experience, 1607-1783. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Eisner, E. W. (ed.). Confronting curriculum reform. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

English, F. W. Contemporary curriculum circumstances. In English, F. W. (ed.). Fundamental curriculum decisions. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

English, F. W. (ed.). Fundamental curriculum decisions. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Fuhrman, S. and Rosenthal, A. (eds.). Shaping education policy in the states. Washington: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1981.

Geisert, G. A. Control of curriculum: a state legislative priority? Education and urban society 13 (May 1981).

Iannaccone, L. Increasing irresponsibility in education: a growing gap between policy planning and operational groups. In Kirst, M. W. State, school and politics. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1972.

Iannaccone, L. Politics in education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1967.

Iannaccone, L. Three views of change in educational politics. In Scribner, J. D. (ed.). The politics of education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1977.

Katz, E. Politics and governance at the state level: state political processes and educational policy. Paper prepared for the School Finance Project, National Institute of Education, 1981.

Katz, M. B. The irony of early school reform. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Kirst, M. W. State, school and politics. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1972.

Kirst, M. W. and Walker, D. F. An analysis of curriculum policy-making. Review of educational research 41 (1971).

Lutz, F. W. Methods and conceptualizations of political power in education. In Scribner, J. D. (ed.). The politics of education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1977.

Mazzoni, T. L., Jr. and Campbell, R. F. Influentials in state policy-making for the public schools. Education administration quarterly 12 (Winter 1976).

Mitchell, D. E. and Encarnation, D. J. Alternative state policy mechanisms for influencing school performance. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Newitt, J. (ed.). Future trends in education policy. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1979.

Popkewitz, T. S., Tabachnick, B. R., and Wehlage, G. The myth of educational reform. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

Ravitch, D. The troubled crusade: American education, 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Reid, W. A. The changing curriculum: theory and practice. In Reid, W. A. and Walker, D. F. (eds.). Case studies in curriculum change. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Reid, W. A. and Walker, D. F. (eds.). Case studies in curriculum change. London: Routledge and Kegal Paul, 1975.

Rosenthal, A. and Fuhrman, S. Legislative education leadership. Washington: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1981.

Rosenthal, A. and Fuhrman, S. State legislatures and education policy. Educational horizons (Fall 1982).

Sarason, S. B. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Scribner, J.D. (ed.). The politics of education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1977.

Scribner, J. D. and Englert, R. M. The politics of education: an introduction. In Scribner, J. D. (ed.). The politics of education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1977.

Sherman, J. D. Prospects for financing elementary/secondary education in the states. Final report of the School Finance Project, National Institute of Education, 1982.

Tanner, D. and Tanner, L. N. Curriculum development: theory and practice. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1975.

Tanner, L. N. Curriculum history and educational leadership. Educational leadership (November 1983).

Unruh, G. G. Curriculum politics. In English, F. W. (ed.). Fundamental curriculum decisions. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Walton, S. States' reform efforts increase as focus of issues shifts. Education week (December 7, 1983).

Wirt, F. M. School policy culture and state decentralization. In Scribner, J. D. (ed.). The politics of education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1977.

Wirt, F. M. and Kirst, M. W. Political and social foundations of education. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1972.

****

APPENDIX A

STATES NOT ENGAGED IN
PROGRAM DEFINITION ACTIVITY

****

STATE	POLITICAL CULTURE RANK*	EDUCATION CENTRALIZATION RANK*	SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT RANK*	WELFARE-EDUCATION RANK*
COLORADO	46	19	5	17
IOWA	40	17	20	12
LOUISIANA	9	37	3	36
MAINE	37	41	24	33
MARYLAND	18	27	38	29
MICHIGAN	41	15	30	15
MONTANA	33	29	10	27
SOUTH CAROLINA	4	4	33	45
TEXAS	15	45	34	37
UTAH	44	30	17	23
WISCONSIN	45	25	27	3
WYOMING	26	50	2	21

SOURCE: WALTON (1983)

*--SEE PAGES 7-8 OF PAPER FOR EXPLANATIONS.

****

APPENDIX B

STATES NOT ENGAGED IN
STUDENT TESTING ACTIVITY

****

STATE	POLITICAL CULTURE RANK*	EDUCATION CENTRALIZATION RANK*	SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT RANK*	WELFARE-EDUCATION RANK*
ALASKA**		32		
COLORADO	46	19	5	17
HAWAII**		1		
ILLINOIS	23	33	35	5
INDIANA	19	11	43	24
IOWA	40	17	20	12
MAINE	37	41	24	33
MINNESOTA	48	8	12	4
MONTANA	33	29	10	27
NEBRASKA	29	16	25	18
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	40	32	8
NEW MEXICO	16	20	15	22
NEW YORK	30	24	1	6
OKLAHOMA	8	2	16	14
SOUTH CAROLINA	4	4	33	45
TEXAS	15	45	34	37
UTAH	44	30	17	23
WASHINGTON	47	5	11	13
WYOMING	26	50	2	21

SOURCE: WALTON (1983)

*-SEE PAGES 7-8 OF PAPER FOR EXPLANATIONS.

**-BLANKS INDICATE NO RANKING FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII.

****

APPENDIX C

STATES NOT ENGAGED IN
PERSONNEL TRAINING-CERTIFICATION ACTIVITY

****

STATE	POLITICAL CULTURE RANK*	EDUCATION CENTRALIZATION RANK*	SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT RANK*	WELFARE-EDUCATION RANK*
COLORADO	46	19	5	17
ILLINOIS	23	33	35	5
IOWA	40	17	20	12
MASSACHUSETTS	28	48	18	2
MICHIGAN	41	15	30	15
MINNESOTA	48	8	12	4
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	40	32	8
OREGON	43	6	7	16

SOURCE: WALTON (1983)

*-SEE PAGES 7-8 OF PAPER FOR EXPLANATIONS.

****

APPENDIX D

STATES ENGAGED IN
ALL FOUR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

****

STATE	POLITICAL CULTURE RANK*	EDUCATION CENTRALIZATION RANK*	SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT RANK*	WELFARE-EDUCATION RANK*
ARKANSAS	1	26	22	42
CALIFORNIA	31	22	9	1
FLORIDA	11	7	28	38
IDAHO	36	34	19	26
KANSAS	27	31	21	10
KENTUCKY	13	12	45	39
MISSISSIPPI	2	10	14	48
MISSOURI	12	46	44	31
NEVADA	22	47	8	34
NORTH CAROLINA	6	18	36	41
OHIO	21	23	42	20
PENNSYLVANIA	24	21	41	25
TENNESSEE	7	28	39	47
VIRGINIA	10	13	46	40
WEST VIRGINIA	14	9	26	43

SOURCE: WALTON (1983)

*-SEE PAGES 7-8 OF PAPER FOR EXPLANATIONS.

APPENDIX E

STATES IN WHICH GOVERNOR
IS A KEY POLICY ACTOR

STATE	POWER OF GOVERNOR RANK*	LEGISLATIVE PROFESSIONALISM RANK*	GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE KEY ACTORS	POLITICAL CULTURE RANK*	EDUCATION CENTRALIZATION RANK*	SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT RANK*	WELFARE-EDUCATION RANK*
ARIZONA	34	26	**	20	43	23	30
IDAHO	18	48		36	34	19	26
INDIANA	46	31	**	19	11	43	24
KANSAS	38	35		27	31	21	10
NEBRASKA	23	28		29	16	25	18
NEW JERSEY	7	6	**	25	14	48	7
PENNSYLVANIA	8	4	**	24	21	41	25
UTAH	10	47		44	30	17	23

SOURCE: WALTON (1983)

*-SEE PAGES 7-8 OF PAPER FOR EXPLANATIONS.

**-LEGISLATURE ALSO A KEY POLICY ACTOR.

****

APPENDIX F

STATES IN WHICH LEGISLATURE
IS A KEY POLICY ACTOR

****

STATE	LEGISLATIVE PROFESSIONALISM RANK*	POLITICAL CULTURE RANK*	EDUCATION CENTRALIZATION RANK*	SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT RANK*	WELFARE-EDUCATION RANK*
ARIZONA	26	20	43	23	30
ARKANSAS	40	1	26	22	42
CALIFORNIA	1	31	22	9	1
FLORIDA	15	11	7	28	38
ILLINOIS	7	23	33	35	5
INDIANA	31	19	11	43	24
KENTUCKY	34	13	12	45	39
LOUISIANA	16	9	37	3	36
MICHIGAN	5	41	15	30	15
MINNESOTA	20	48	8	12	4
MISSISSIPPI	30	2	10	14	48
MISSOURI	21	12	46	44	31
NEW JERSEY	6	25	14	48	7
NORTH CAROLINA	25	6	18	36	41
OKLAHOMA	27	8	2	16	14
PENNSYLVANIA	4	24	21	41	25
VIRGINIA	38	10	13	46	40
WASHINGTON	22	47	5	11	13
WEST VIRGINIA	36	14	9	26	43
WISCONSIN	9	45	25	27	3
WYOMING	50	26	50	2	21

SOURCE: WALTON (1983)

*--SEE PAGES 7-8 OF PAPER FOR EXPLANATIONS.